

MAR 13 1925

UNIVERSITY OF MICH.  
GENERAL LIBRARY

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at  
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.  
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of  
March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on  
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVIII, No. 17

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1925

WHOLE No. 494

A New College Text

## GREEK LIFE AND THOUGHT

A Portrayal of Greek Civilization

BY LA RUE VAN HOOK

*Professor of Greek and Latin in Barnard College*

Pp. xiv+329. \$2.50

The demand for this kind of a book comes from increasing numbers of those who wish to know something of Greek civilization without studying the language. It is used as a text for courses in Classical Civilization in Columbia, Barnard and other Colleges.

This new text-book edition is printed in large clear type on thin paper, is thoroughly illustrated, contains an extensive bibliography, and has a full index. The book is useful as a reference work for High School teachers, for libraries, and for general reading. Every subject treated in the twenty chapters is of importance for modern life.

### REVIEWERS' OPINIONS

"The author has written a handsome, pleasing and learned volume, enriched with a number of splendid illustrations, and with an accurate index".—*Bollettino di filologia classica*.

"'Greek Life and Thought' is well written, and beautifully illustrated, and should be of great service to students and teachers, especially of classes in Greek Life and Greek Literature".—*Professor Paul Shorey*.

"Professor Van Hook's work is a notably thorough and solid compendium of facts belonging to many branches of classical philology and archaeology. It is ambitious in scope and concise in treatment. It is a handbook of great utility".—*American Historical Review*.

"Professor Van Hook's book is the most successful of many recent attempts. His material is well selected, his style is lucid, his judgments in the main are sound and scholarly".—*The Nation*.

"I place it first upon a reading list because the spirit in which it is written is in the best sense of the word the Greek spirit".—*May Lamberton Becker, in The Literary Review*.

"This is a competent work by an American scholar designed to put before a non-specialist public the principal points of Greek Civilization".—*The London Times Literary Supplement*.

"If the tendency to reduce the emphasis placed on Ancient History in our schools is to be counteracted, there may be no more effective means than the use of such a work as this".—*The Historical Outlook*.

*At Bookshops or direct from the publishers*

**COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS**

2960 Broadway

New York

**Ginn and  
Company**

*Boston  
New York  
Chicago  
London  
Atlanta  
Dallas  
Columbus  
San Francisco*

*Nearly ready*

## ORATIONS OF CICERO

WITH A SELECTION FROM HIS LETTERS

By Frank G. Moore, Columbia University

A new edition which offers a wider range of reading than is common in the third year of Latin. It includes, in addition to the six orations usually read, a series of selections from the *Fourth Verrine* (among these are the chapters on Syracuse recently recommended for College entrance); the *Pro Marcello*; and a number of *Letters* chosen for the light they throw on Cicero's life, or on the speeches. Notes, Grammatical Outline, Exercises in Prose Composition, and Vocabulary provide all the material needed for third-year work.

## The Approach through English to all grammatical constructions

makes PLACE'S BEGINNING LATIN easy for the pupil to understand and easy for the teacher to teach. The chapters on "English Prefixes and Suffixes", "Latin Abbreviations in English", "Familiar Quotations from Latin", "Latin Words and Phrases in Common Use", and "The Classical Influence Upon Advertising" are unusually interesting to young people. They will add appreciation and interest to all later reading.

The author of this book is PERLEY OAKLAND PLACE, Litt.D.  
Professor of Latin, Syracuse University

The price is \$1.40

**AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY**

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVIII, No. 17

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1925

WHOLE No. 494

## AMERICAN DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS IN CLASSICS 1912-1921

Late in 1913, or early in 1914, the Library of Congress issued, through the Government Printing Office, at Washington, a volume of 106 pages, entitled *A List of American Doctoral Dissertations Printed in 1912*. This volume began with an Introduction (7-9), explaining the circumstances under which the publication of the volume had been undertaken, and the method followed in the preparation of this particular list. Information was given also concerning places at which lists of dissertations in Classics, in natural and exact sciences, in history, in political economy, and in political science had been published or were to be published in the future. Then came Alphabetical List of Theses Printed in 1912 (13-45); Classified List of the Theses of 1912, Arranged under the Broad Classes of the Library of Congress Scheme (49-90); Subject Index (93-100); Doctors Whose Theses Have Been Printed During 1912 <listed under the names of the Colleges and the Universities granting the degrees> (103-106). For a brief notice of this volume, by Professor W. A. Heidel, see *The Classical Journal* 10.85-86 (November, 1914).

In the meantime nine more volumes have been issued by the Library of Congress, which give lists of theses for 1913-1921. The various volumes are on sale, in the office of the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at 35 cents per volume. Students and teachers of the Classics would find it worth their while to have a complete file of these volumes, because through them they would get a knowledge of many dissertations of value to them in their special studies and in their teaching. Not only will the dissertations done under the direct supervision of Classical Departments of various Colleges and Universities be of interest and service to them, but they will find much of interest and value in dissertations done under the Departments of English and Comparative Literature, dissertations concerned in particular with the influence of classical authors on modern authors. So, too, not a few dissertations done under the direction of Departments of History, Sociology, and Economics will be of service. I know of no other good way of keeping track of dissertations of the latter types.

In the Library of Congress volume entitled *A List of American Doctoral Dissertations Printed in 1920* there are 179 pages, whose contents are as follows:

Fifth Supplementary List of Theses Printed in 1912 <9>; Third Supplementary List of Theses Printed in 1916 <9>; Second Supplementary List of Theses

Printed in 1918 <10>; Supplementary List of Theses Printed in 1919 <11-12>; Alphabetical List of Theses Printed in 1920 <13-80: 300 items>; Classified Lists of Theses in 1920, Arranged under the Broad Classes of the Library of Congress Scheme <83-153>; Subject Index <155-168>; Alphabetical List by University of Doctors whose Theses Were Printed in 1920 <175-179>.

It might be remarked that there is a certain measure of wastefulness in this volume (and its predecessors), because the facts about each dissertation are given in full several times. In the "Classified Lists" it would be enough to give the name of the author and the title of the dissertation, with a reference back to the earlier page where a full description has been given (the fact that the dissertations in each annual list are numbered would facilitate such cross-reference).

Of course no one scheme can be devised that will be in itself completely satisfactory. So the classification adopted by the Library of Congress might well cause the classical student to overlook, from time to time, some dissertations, which, as a matter of fact, are dissertations in Classics. The captions on pages 83-154 of the 1920 volume, for instance, are as follows: Philosophy, Religion (Class B); History (except American) (Class D); <History> American (Classes E-F); Geography, Anthropology (Class G); Social Sciences (Class H); Political Science (Class J); Education (Class L); Fine Arts (Class N); Language and Literature (Class P); Science (Class Q); Medicine (Class R); Agriculture—Plant and Animal Industry, etc. (Class S); Technology (Class T).

The dissertation by Professor Henry Jewell Bassett, *Macrinus and Diadumenianus* (Michigan), reviewed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 14.174-175, and that by Dr. Alice Hill Byrne, *Titus Pomponius Atticus: Chapters of a Biography*, reviewed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 15.62-64, appear under the caption History. So too does the dissertation by Dr. Helen McClees, *A Study of Women in Attic Inscriptions* (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 14.197-199). The dissertation by Dr. Eleanor Ferguson Rambo, *Lions in Greek Art* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 18.52-53) appears under the caption Fine Arts.

Prior to 1913, various Colleges and Universities themselves published lists of Doctoral degrees granted by them. Mention may be made here of such publications as *Lists of Degrees Granted at Clark University and Clark College*, prepared by Louis N. Wilson (1912); *Doctors of Philosophy and Doctors of Science Who Have Received Their Degrees in Courses at Harvard University, 1873-1909* (1910); *Doctors of Philosophy of the Graduate Schools, University of Pennsylvania, 1889-1912* (1912); *List of Theses Submitted by Candidates for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Colum-*



bia University, 1872-1910 (printed as Columbia University Bulletin of Information, Tenth Series, No. 26, July, 1910).

The Johns Hopkins University Circular, No. 226, published in June, 1910, contained the following matter: Notes From the Classical Seminaries, brief articles by B. L. Gildersleeve, K. F. Smith, H. L. Wilson, W. S. Fox, R. V. D. Magoffin, C. W. E. Miller, C. H. Saylor, A. P. Wagener (3-37); Unpublished Classical Dissertations (37-38); Ten Years of Classical Philology (39-78); Programmes of Courses in the Classical Languages, Archaeology, and History, for the Academic Year 1910-1911 (79-86). Under the caption Ten Years of Classical Philology were listed the publications of "present or former members of this University for the period extending from January 1, 1900, to January 1, 1910". A number of the entries here were doctoral dissertations.

In *The Classical Journal* 1.233-239 (June, 1906), Mr. J. J. Schlicher printed a List of Doctors' Dissertations in the Classics, 1900-1905, and declared that it was the intention of *The Classical Journal* to publish similar lists from year to year thereafter, so that its files might finally contain a complete list of classical dissertations written in this country. This list gave 140 dissertations arranged primarily according to the names of the Universities by which the degrees were granted. Within each group the arrangement was chronological. Later lists appearing in *The Classical Journal* were as follows (all were compiled by Mr. Schlicher): Classical Dissertations in America, 1905-6, 2.177-179 (February, 1907: 31 items); Doctor's Degrees in the Classics, 1906-7, 3.198-199 (March, 1908: 29 items); Doctors' Dissertations in the Classics (1907-8), 4.180-181 (March, 1908: 22 items); Doctors of Philosophy in the Classics, 1908-9, 5.133-134 (January, 1910: 27 items); Doctor's Dissertations in Classical Departments for the Year Ending July 1, 1910, 6.373-374 (June, 1911: 22 items); Doctors' Dissertations in the Classics, 1910-11, 7.187-188 (January, 1912: 21 items).

It is to be noticed that these lists gave not merely published dissertations, but titles of all dissertations accepted by the Departments in the various Colleges and Universities for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Some of these have never been published.

I do not know, but I assume that the publication of the volumes by the Library of Congress giving lists of all dissertations published year by year caused the giving up by *The Classical Journal* of this very useful plan of publishing, from year to year, lists of classical dissertations.

In various volumes of *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* will be found brief abstracts of doctoral dissertations in Classics accepted by Harvard University. These dissertations, done at first in Latin, are sometimes published later, in more or less modified form, in English, in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*.

The University of Chicago Bulletin of Information, 22, No. 4 (May, 1922) contained a Register of Doctors of Philosophy of the University of Chicago, June 1893-December 1921 (96 pages). The contents of the pamphlet are as follows:

Table of Contents <3>; Doctors of Philosophy of the University of Chicago <5-87>, arranged as follows: Social Science Group, Philosophy <5-8>, Psychology <8-10>, Education <10-13>, Political Economy <13-15>, Political Science <15-16>, History <16-19>, Sociology <19-21>, History of Art <22>, Household Administration <22>, Home Economics <22>, Comparative Religion <22>; Divinity School Group <23-30>, Oriental Languages and Literatures <23-25>, New Testament Literature and Interpretation <25-27>, Systematic Theology <27-28>, Church History <28-29>, Religious Education <29-30>; Classical Group <31-36>, Greek <31-33>, Latin <33-35>, Comparative Philology <35-36>; Modern Language Group <37-44>, Romance Languages and Literatures <37-38>, Germanic Language and Literatures <38-41>, English Language and Literature <41-44>; Mathematics and Science Group <44-66>; Earth Science Group <66-70>; Biological Group <71-87>; Numerical Summary <88>; Index of Names <89-96>.

I may notice that, for the past four or five years, in the article entitled Philology, Classical, which I contribute annually to *The New International Year Book*, I have given lists of American doctoral dissertations in the classical field published within the preceding year. But these lists are inevitably incomplete. Only the Library of Congress can expect to receive copies of all dissertations.

I have gone through the Library of Congress Lists of Doctoral Dissertations, 1912-1921, to select therefrom the dissertations that bear in any way on classical matters. These are gathered together in a single combined list, arranged in the alphabetical order of the authors' names<sup>1</sup>. Most of the dissertations here listed were prepared under the direction of Classical Departments. Perhaps a fourth, however, were prepared under the supervision of other Departments.

A very large measure of the time and the energy of professors in American Universities goes into the supervision of doctoral dissertations. Where close supervision is not given to a dissertation, the candidate's work is apt to show marked defects, alike in form and in substance. A list of doctoral dissertations throws light on the interests of professors and of the students whose work they supervise, and on the labors of both classes; it also gives some indication of the promise that the future holds out for classical studies.

1. Adams, Louise E. W.: *A Study in the Commerce of Latium From the Early Iron Age Through the Sixth Century B. C.* (Bryn Mawr, 1920<sup>2</sup>). *Smith College Classical Studies*, No. 2, April, 1921. Pp. 84.—A. E. R. Boak, C. W. 18.70-71; Lily R. Taylor,

<sup>1</sup>It has seemed worth while to give, whenever it was possible, some indication of the physical dimensions of the dissertations. Unhappily, the cryptographic method employed by the Library of Congress to indicate the number of pages, etc., in a dissertation is admirably calculated to conceal from every one, save those whose whole lives are spent in libraries, the very information it seeks to convey. Whenever I could do so readily, I have verified the figures given under the various items.

<sup>2</sup>At the end of various items I have indicated where a review of a given dissertation might be found. That the labor involved here might not be too great, I have confined the references to *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, *The Classical Review*, *The Classical Journal*, *Classical Philology*, *The American Journal of Philology*, and the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* (B. P. W.), known since January 1, 1921 as the *Philologische Wochenschrift* (P. W.).

<sup>3</sup>Matter such as this in parenthesis gives the name of the institution granting the degree and the date at which the degree was bestowed.

- C. P. 17.267-268; G. H. Stevenson, C. R. 36.42; Gordon J. Laing, A. J. P. 45.291-292.
2. Alexander, Leigh: *The Kings of Lydia and a Rearrangement of Some Fragments of Nicolaus of Damascus* (Princeton, 1914). Princeton University Press, 1914. Pp. 61.—R. G. Kent, C. W. 8.207-208; A. G. Laird, C. P. 11.354-355; H. Kallenberg, B. P. W. 34.1454-1455.
  3. Ameringer, Thomas Edward: *The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Panegyric Sermons of St. John Chrysostom: A Study in Greek Rhetoric* (Catholic University of America, 1921). Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C., 1921. Pp. 103.—Harry M. Hubbell, C. W. 16.95-96; H. E. Butler, C. R. 36.189; Friedrich Levy, P. W. 42.774-775.
  4. Amos, Flora Ross: *Early Theories of Translation* (Columbia, 1919). Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature. Columbia University Press, 1920. Pp. xiv + 184.—La Rue Van Hook, C. W. 15.183-184.
  5. Archibald, Herbert Thompson: *The Fable as a Stylistic Test in Classical Greek Literature* (Johns Hopkins, 1901). Baltimore, J. H. Furst Company, 1912. Pp. vi + 79.
  6. Askowith, Dora: *The Toleration and Persecution of the Jews in the Roman Empire. Part I: The Toleration of the Jews Under Julius Caesar and Augustus* (Columbia, 1915). New York, 1915. Pp. xiii + 235.
  7. Basiline, Sister Mary: *The Aesthetic Motif from Thales to Plato* (Colorado, 1921). New York, Schwartz, Kirwin and Fauss, 1921. Pp. xi + 99.
  8. Bassett, Henry Jewell: *Macrinus and Diadumenianus* (Michigan, 1920). Menasha, Wisconsin, George Banta Publishing Company, 1920. Pp. 94.—G. A. Harrer, C. W. 14.174-175.
  9. Beardslee, John Walter: *The Use of *phóros* in Fifth-century Greek Literature* (Chicago, 1913). University of Chicago Press, 1918. Pp. v + 126.—G. E. K. Braunholtz, C. R. 34.68-69.
  10. Beers, Ethel Ella: *Euripides and Later Greek Thought* (Chicago, 1912). Menasha, Wisconsin, George Banta Publishing Company, 1914. Pp. 113.
  11. Bennett, Florence Mary: *Religious Cults Associated with the Amazons* (Columbia, 1912). Columbia University Press, 1912. Pp. 79.—W. A. Heidel, C. W. 7.78-79; Gordon J. Laing, C. J. 9.408-409; O. Gruppe, B. P. W. 33.1587.
  12. Billings, Mrs. Grace Elvina: *The Art of Transition in Plato* (Chicago, 1915). Private Edition Distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, 1920. Pp. 104.—Harry M. Hubbell, C. W. 15.165-166.
  13. Billings, Thomas Henry: *The Platonism of Philo Judaeus* (Chicago, 1915). University of Chicago Press, 1919. Pp. viii + 105.—Theodore Leslie Shear, C. W. 13.126; Roger Miller Jones, C. P. 17.179-184.
  14. Blake, Harriet Manning: *Classic Myth in the Poetic Drama of the Age of Elizabeth* (Pennsylvania, 1911). Lancaster, Pa., Steinman and Foltz, 1912. Pp. 84.
  15. Blancké, Wilton Wallace: *The Dramatic Values in Plautus* (Pennsylvania, 1916). Geneva, New York, W. F. Humphrey, 1918. Pp. 69.—Eugene S. McCartney, C. W. 15.45-47; Keith Preston, C. J. 14.460.
  16. Bourne, Ella: *A Study of Tibur—Historical, Literary, and Epigraphical—From the Earliest Times to the Close of the Roman Empire* (Johns Hopkins, 1914). Menasha, Wisconsin, George Banta Publishing Company, 1916. Pp. 74.—J. G. Winter, C. W. 12.120; Elizabeth H. Haight, C. J. 12.351-352; Friedrich Lohr, B. P. W. 37.1026-1029.
  17. Bowerman, Helen Cox: *Roman Sacrificial Altars: An Archaeological Study of Monuments in Rome* (Bryn Mawr, 1912). Lancaster, Pa., New Era Printing Company, 1913. Pp. 103.
  18. Boyd, Clarence Eugene: *Public Libraries and Literary Culture in Ancient Rome* (Wisconsin, 1909). University of Chicago Press, 1915. Pp. 77.—J. W. H. Walden, C. W. 10.96; F. W. Hall, C. R. 36.31-32.
  19. Brandt, Lida Roberts: *Social Aspects of Greek Life in the Sixth Century B. C.* (Columbia, 1921). This dissertation was done under the direction of the Department of History. Philadelphia, T. C. Davis and Sons, 1921. Pp. 109.
  20. Bräunlich, Alice Freda: *The Indicative Indirect Question in Latin* (Chicago, 1913). Private Edition, Distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, 1920. Pp. xxxi + 211.—R. G. Kent, C. W. 15.87-88; Wilhelm Baehrens, P. W. 43.222-227.
  21. Brehaut, Ernest: *An Encyclopedist of the Dark Ages: Isidore of Seville* (Columbia, 1912). Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, Volume 48, No. 1, Whole No. 120. New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1912. Pp. 275.
  22. Brewster, Ethel Hampson: *Roman Craftsmen and Tradesmen of the Early Empire* (Pennsylvania, 1915). Menasha, Wisconsin, George Banta Publishing Company, 1917. Pp. xiv + 101.—F. W. Wright, C. W. 12.38-39.
  23. Broughton, Leslie Nathan: *The Theocritean Element in the Works of William Wordsworth* (Cornell, 1911). Halle, Niemeyer, 1920. Pp. 193.
  24. Brooks, Mrs. Beatrice (Allard): *A Contribution to the Study of the Moral Practices of Certain Social Groups in Ancient Mesopotamia* (Bryn Mawr, 1920). Leipzig, W. Drugulin, 1921. Pp. 90.
  25. Brown, Hazel Louise: *Extemporaneous Speech in Antiquity* (Chicago, 1911). Menasha, Wisconsin, George Banta Publishing Company, 1914. Pp. 184.
  26. Buenger, Theodore Arthur: *Crete in the Greek Tradition* (Pennsylvania, 1914). Philadelphia, 1915. Pp. 74.
  27. Burchett, Bessie R.: *Janus in Roman Life and Cult: A Study in Roman Religion* (Pennsylvania, 1913). Menasha, Wisconsin, George Banta Publishing Company, 1918. Pp. 75.—Joseph W. Hewitt, C. W. 13.67-69.
  28. Byrne, Alice Hill: *Titus Pomponius Atticus. Chapters of a Biography* (Bryn Mawr, 1918). Bryn Mawr, 1920. Pp. viii + 103.—W. D. Gray, C. W. 15.62-64; Alfred Klotz, P. W. 41.1114-1115.
  29. Byrne, Sister Marie José: *Prolegomena to an*

Edition of the Works of Decimus Magnus Ausonius (Columbia, 1915). Columbia University Press, 1916. Pp. viii + 101.—John C. Rolfe, C. W. 11.31; J. S. P<hillimore>, C. R. 32.190-191; Kirby Flower Smith, A. J. P. 38.320-321.

30. Caldwell, Wallace Everett: Hellenic Conceptions of Peace (Columbia, 1919). Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, Volume 84, No. 2, Whole No. 195. New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1919. Pp. 141.—William K. Prentice, C. W. 14.148-149; Frank Granger, C. R. 36.190; Johannes B. Hofmann, P. W. 41.1014-1018.

31. Calhoun, George Miller: Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation (Chicago, 1911). Austin, Texas, University of Texas Bulletin, Humanistic Series, No. 14, 1913. Pp. 172.—Mitchell Carroll, C. W. 8.159-160; W. S. Ferguson, C. P. 9.344.

32. Canfield, Leon Hardy: The Early Persecutions of the Christians (Columbia, 1913). Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, Volume 55, No. 2, Whole No. 136. New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1913. Pp. 217.

33. Carpenter, Rhys: The Ethics of Euripides (Columbia, 1916). Printed in Archives of Philosophy, No. 7, May, 1916. Columbia University Press, 1916. Pp. 48.—William K. Prentice, C. W. 11.172-173.

34. Chubb, Ethel Leigh: An Anonymous Epistle of Dido to Aeneas (Anthologia Latina 83). (Pennsylvania, 1920). Philadelphia, 1920. Pp. 57.—H. C. Coffin, C. W. 16.109-110.

35. Clark, Clifford Pease: Numerical Phraseology in Vergil (Princeton, 1910). Princeton, The Falcon Press, 1913. Pp. 89.—George D. Hadzsits, C. W. 9.31-32; H. Rushton Fairclough, C. P. 10.360-361; P. Jahn, B. P. W. 35.850-851.

36. Clark, Frederick William: The Influence of Sea-Power on the History of the Roman Republic (Chicago, 1913). Menasha, Wisconsin, George Banta Publishing Company, 1915. Pp. xi + 112.

37. Cohoon, James Wilfred: Rhetorical Studies in the Arbitration Scene of Menander's Epitrepontes (Princeton, 1914). Printed in the Transactions of the American Philological Association, Volume 45 (1915), 141-230; G. Ammon, B. P. W. 36.1129-1131.

38. Cole, Erma Eloise: The Samos of Herodotus (Yale, 1910). New Haven, The Tuttle, Morehouse and Taylor Company, 1912. Pp. 39.

39. Coleman, Christopher Bush: Constantine the Great and Christianity; Three Phases: The Historical, the Legendary and the Spurious (Columbia, 1914). Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University, Volume 60, No. 1, Whole No. 146. Longmans, Green and Company, 1914. Pp. 259.

40. Conrad, Clinton C.: The Technique of Continuous Action in Roman Comedy (Chicago, 1914). Menasha, Wisconsin, George Banta Publishing Company, 1915. Pp. 86.—R. C. Flickinger, C. W. 10.147-151; A. W. Hodgman, C. W. 10.146-147; Alfred Klotz, B. P. W. 37.1452-1460.

(To be Concluded) CHARLES KNAPP

## AENEID 8.96

In Aeneid 8.86-96<sup>1</sup>, Vergil thus describes the approach of Aeneas and his comrades to the city of Evander:

Thybris ea fluvium quam longa est nocte tumentem  
leniit, et tacita refluens ita substitit unda,  
mitis ut in morem stagni placidaeque paludis  
sterneret aequor aquis, remo ut luctamen abesset.  
Ergo iter inceptum celerant rumore secundo;  
labitur uncta vadis abies, mirantur et undae,  
miratur nemus insuetum fulgentia longe  
scuta virum fluvio pictasque innare carinas.  
Olli remigio nocternae diemque fatigant,  
et longos superant flexus, variisque teguntur  
arboribus, viridisque secant placido aequore silvas.

Did Vergil, in verse 96, mean that the Trojans, as they rowed up the Tiber to the future site of Rome, cut with their boats the green woods reflected in the calm water, or merely what Dr. W. Warde Fowler, in the first edition of his Aeneas at the Site of Rome (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 13.197-198), takes these words to mean? "What the words really mean to me is simply the picture of boats gliding through the quiet water which divided the woods on each bank". In his second edition he says (page 47),

... Some editors from Servius downwards have wished to refer to the shadows of trees in the water. In my first edition I said that Henry<sup>2</sup>, in my opinion, had demolished this view once for all. His long note is an admirable lesson in Latin literature, and I still find it difficult to disagree with him. But after much meditation and correspondence I do not feel so sure as I did.

The note is characteristic of the scholar whose long and diligent application can force books to reveal their secrets. Vergil, too, was a scholar, steeped in literary and antiquarian lore, but in addition he was a close observer of nature. He must have formed the habit of such observation in his boyhood, as he wandered near his home in the country, when he would have taken pleasure in the reflections in the Mincius, reflections to which, perhaps, the story of Narcissus had first called his attention. If he watched the growing shadows drawn out by the departing sun, *et sol crescentis decedens duplicat umbras* (Eclogue 2.67), and the lengthening shadows that fall from the high mountains, *maioresque cadunt altis de montibus umbrae* (Eclogue 1.84), and those that range the hollows of the mountains, *montibus umbrae lustrabunt convexa* (Aen. 1.607-608), would he not take delight also in seeing the reflections in water? Indeed, in Eclogue 2.25-26, he makes Corydon say, *Nuper me in litore vidi cum placidum vento staret mare*.

It is true that Conington objects to the last two lines, and argues that "It is just possible that a Mediterranean cove might be calm enough to mirror a giant, not possible that it should be calm enough to mirror Corydon". He holds that Vergil was here merely imitating Theocritus 6.34-40. Miss Mary Bradford Peaks, who, in her paper on Vergil's Seaman-

<sup>1</sup>For a very happy and suggestive use of the entire passage in which Vergil describes the meeting of Aeneas and Evander, see W. Warde Fowler, *Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero* (Macmillan, 1909), Chapter I, Topographical (1-23).

<sup>2</sup>Dr. Fowler had in mind James Henry, *Aeneidea*, or *Critical, Exegetical and Aesthetical Remarks on the Aeneid* (4 volumes, London, Williams and Norgate, 1873-1882).



ship, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 15.201-205, proved conclusively the accuracy, in the main, of Vergil's nautical knowledge, thinks that in this case he is wrong (201): "In Vergil's early poems. . . the rare allusions to the sea are conventional or false. . . In Eclogue 2.26 Corydon uses the edge of a windless sea as a mirror!" But last summer, by actually observing my own shadow and those of my companions perfectly silhouetted on the crystal wavelets of the Mediterranean where Scylla and Charybdis used to terrify seamen, I gained proof that on the not absolutely calm water of the Mediterranean a perfectly distinct and recognizable shadow can be cast; and if a distinct shadow, then, with change of position of the observer, a distinct reflection may be obtained. Vergil, therefore, is correct in giving Corydon this mirror; and, instead of merely copying Theocritus and making a false allusion to the sea, he went Theocritus one better, and showed far more knowledge of reflections than his critics display.

If Vergil observed reflections on the edge of the sea, he must have learned to look for them there because he had seen them in rivers. His early home was inland. From boyhood he may have been familiar with the sight of boats cutting through reflections in the Mincius. Why then, should he not speak of such a sight, as beautiful as shadows ranging the hollows of the mountains? If Dr. Fowler had added to his meditation and correspondence about verse 96 just one walk with a seeing eye along the bank of a muddy stream of rather swift motion, he would have found it difficult, not to disagree with Dr. Henry, but to agree with him.

Perhaps it is Dr. Henry's intense admiration of Vergil, and his eagerness to keep his poet out of the company of "felon Serviuses and laureates" that blinds him to what Conington<sup>1</sup> calls "the pictorial effect of the words", which, he thinks, "pleads strongly for Serv.'s <=Servius's> interpretation, referring the words to sailing through the reflection of trees on the water", although he adds, out of deference to Dr. Henry's opinion, "the thought *may* be too modern for Virg."

It is in order here to quote in full Servius's note on verse 96:

*secant placido aequore silvas ostendit adeo perspicuam fuisse naturam fluminis, ut in eo apparerent imagines nemorum, quas Troianae naves secabant. Terentianus: natura sic est fluminis, ut obvias imagines [nemorum] receptet in lucem suam.*

Dr. Henry brings forward three arguments to "demolish this view forever".

I think not—first, because the idea, however suitable for a *petit-maitre* laureate, or laureate's ode (compare Tennyson's ". . . my shallop clove the citron shadows in the blue") were wholly beneath the dignity of a poet, especially of Virgil, and wholly unsuitable to a great epic.

Tennyson's lines may be wholly unsuitable for a great epic, but they were not written for one, and they are very different from the simple and direct *viridisque secant placido aequore silvas*. Henry's spiteful contempt for Tennyson has prejudiced him against Vergil's

use of any idea that has even a slight similarity in thought to the lines of the Victorian. It is difficult, however, to perceive why "they cleave the green woods in the calm levels" is less poetic, or less epic, than verses 91-93, which win the praise of Dr. Henry. Is there less dignity in boats cutting the reflections in the calm water than in wave and grove wondering at the far-gleaming shields and painted boats?

It requires little scholarship, but some observation of reflections in water, to refute Dr. Henry's "Secondly, because the river, although described as placid, is not described as clear; on the contrary, is described as very muddy, 7.31: 'multa flavus arena' . . ."

In support of this, Dr. Fowler, in the first edition of his *Aeneas at the Site of Rome* (comment on verse 96), writes:

. . . To what he says, I may add that the shadows of trees in water are not distinctly green, but rather dark or even black; and also that, apart from its muddiness and its width, the Tiber is too swift a stream to reflect trees clearly.

Only a little observation of muddy streams in morning or afternoon when reflections are clearest will prove the error of these views. Even at midday, if the observer is in the right position, so that he sees the object between the sun and the reflecting surface, he will be able to see reflections in any mud puddle; for whether one sees objects reflected with every color given back to the eye or merely shadows that are "rather dark or even black" depends on the position of the observer. As to the Tiber's being too swift a stream for reflections, it certainly is not rapid in its whole course from Rome to Ostia, the portion of the stream on which the Trojans *longos superant flexus*. I saw it last summer, gray and still in its banks, then at its clearest and stillest, no doubt, as it flowed slowly down to Ostia. If it flowed through a more hilly country, there would still be reaches of calm in some of its curves. I know this to be true, because my own Shenandoah River, which flows through much higher hills than any near the Tiber between Rome and the sea, has many curves and broad stretches where the swift waters grow still and mirror perfectly the hills which border the banks.

The Tiber appeared none too wide for the shadows and reflections of trees in their pristine growth to stretch across it at the time when *sol crescentis decedens <or accedens> duplicat umbras*. As we motored by the Roman river, I called on my companions to notice with me the distinct reflection of the green shrubs and occasional trees which grew along the banks. They could be seen even where the current was perceptible. In Georgia, too, in the early spring I have seen reflections of young green willows in the poet Lanier's river, the Chattahoochee, a muddy, dull-orange stream, which flows somewhat swiftly beneath the willows. I have looked from the train on a cloudy day in June, and have seen reflected on the surfaces of streams the green things growing on their banks. On some there were only the shadows of the trees, "dark or even black", because my position was between the sun and

<sup>1</sup>John Conington, P. Vergili Maronis Opera, The Works of Virgil With a Commentary, Volume 3<sup>d</sup>, page 98.

the object, whose shadow, not reflection, I saw. Therefore I conclude that reflections giving back the color and the distinct outline of objects can be seen not only in clear and calm water, but also in muddy and somewhat swift water, and not only on clear, but also on cloudy days.

Dr. Henry's "Thirdly, because the voyage was performed by night no less than by day, and by night at least the citron shadows would vanish from the blue" impresses me as facetious; it can be refuted by his praise of verses 91-93, for by night at least gleaming shields and painted ships also would vanish from the wondering gaze of wave and grove.

What I intended at first to do was only to show that by observation I had found that the portion of Dr. Fowler's comment on 8.96 which has reference to reflections in water is erroneous. When, however, I read Dr. Henry's note, to which Dr. Fowler refers for support, I found that Dr. Henry takes *aequore* as instrumental ablative. With this Dr. Fowler agrees. I cannot resist speaking of this matter, though I realize that it is daring to take issue with two such learned scholars when they agree on a point of this sort. Dr. Henry cites Aen. 8.62 as

... a passage sufficient in my mind, alone and of itself, to decide a question which should never have been raised. Exactly as here the Trojans SECANT AEQUORE SILVAS the Tiberinus there "secat flumine culta". . . AEQUORE is the instrument by means of which Aeneas and his companions cut the woods, as "flumine" is the instrument by means of which Tiberinus cuts the "culta". To carry out the view of Servius and his followers, and convict Virgil of the clap-net, the word *in* is wanting, a very little word, indeed, but here sufficient by its presence or absence to acquit or condemn a great poet, to discharge him out of court with green and flourishing laurels, or send him to keep company for ever with felon Serviuses and Laureates. . . .

But there appears to be no more need of *in* to make the ablative local here than in many other places of the Aeneid, for example 1.97 *Iliacis . . . campis*, 4.147 *ipse ingis graditur Cynthis*, 4.149 *Tela sonant umeris*. Is it possible for the Trojans to use the river as the river god himself wields it? Common sense rebels at this notion, especially in this particular passage, where Tiberinus is so graciously active in behalf of the Trojans.

Returning to my main point, I express my belief that Vergil meant, in verse 96, what Servius says he meant, and not what Dr. Henry or any other critic who knows equally little about reflections says he meant; that nothing beautiful in nature escaped Vergil's discerning eye; that no thought in connection with nature can be too modern for him; and that, as Shelley<sup>4</sup> says of him, "The chosen delicacy of <his> expressions. . . <is> as a mist of light which conceal <s> from us the intense and exceeding truth of his conceptions of nature"<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>4</sup>Percy Bysshe Shelley, *A Defense of Poetry*, edited by Albert S. Cook, 24 (Ginn and Company, 1891).

<sup>5</sup>Miss Campbell's paper shows what is yet to be accomplished within the classical field by those who, unfettered by the authority of mighty names, look and think for themselves. One recalls, for instance, how easily some one, by using his eyes in examining the mouths of sheep of various ages, settled the meaning of *bidenus* (see this word in the Vocabulary of my edition of the Aeneid). Yet a kinswoman of mine, not long after I had, myself, verified this account, heard a professor of Latin speak jeeringly of some one

I know of no better way to end my comment than to give the rest of Conington's note on 8.96:

Even if we take the clause as a mere repetition of the preceding, we may still suppose that Virgil intended us to think of the reflections by the juxtaposition of 'viridis' and 'placido'. The whole passage is eminently characteristic of Virgil, both in its graceful feeling and in its abstinent brevity. He is paying a tribute, we may remember, to the beauty of the river of Rome.

AGNES SCOTT COLLEGE,  
DECATUR, GEORGIA

MARY E. CAMPBELL

## SIR JOHN CHEKE AND ARISTOTLE'S POETICS

Apparently there is no reference to Aristotle's *Poetics* in English literature from the thirteenth century to about the middle of the sixteenth. The history of the treatise in England has recently been given in outline by Professor Lane Cooper<sup>1</sup>, at whose suggestion I am now attempting a more detailed treatment of the subject. The following note has to do with an early reference to the *Poetics* by Sir John Cheke, one of the pioneer Aristotelian scholars of the English Renaissance.

Roger Bacon (1214-1294) refers to the Aristotelis *Poetria* of Hermannus Alemannus, a Latin version of the Arabic commentary by Averroes<sup>2</sup>. From Bacon we must take a long step forward to Tudor England. Martin Bucer, the German reformer who taught for a time at Cambridge, refers to Aristotle's *peripeteia*, in *De Honestis Ludis*, a chapter in his *De Regno Christi*, which seems to have been written during the winter of 1550-1551, and which was presented to the boy-king Edward VI as a New Year's gift<sup>3</sup>. The *De Regno Christi* was not published, however, until 1557 (at Basel). From Roger Ascham we learn that, by the middle of the century, the *Poetics* was being studied at Cambridge. In his *Schoolmaster*, he writes<sup>4</sup>:

When Mr. Watson, in St. John's College at Cambridge, wrote his excellent tragedy of Absalon, Mr. Cheke, he, and I, for that part of true Imitation, had many pleasant talks together, in comparing the precepts of Aristotle and Horace de Arte Poetica with the examples of Euripides, Sophocles, and Seneca.

The *Schoolmaster* was published in 1570, but in mentioning the "precepts of Aristotle" Ascham refers to a much earlier date, in all probability more than twenty-five years before 1570. Cheke was called from

who had actually looked into the mouths of sheep in connection with this word! In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2.1, I called attention to the important discoveries made, in 1907, in connection with the Column of Trajan, all resulting from the fact that Commandatore Boni had used his common sense, and his eyes, where others had been content to let their minds stay asleep and their eyes to see and yet see naught. In a review of S. B. Platner, *The Monuments and Topography of Ancient Rome*, and of Ch. Huelsen, *Das Forum Romanum*, *American Journal of Philology* 26 (1904), 213-217, 217-221, 368-369, I called attention to the ease with which, if they had been willing to use their eyes on external things rather than on the printed page, these scholars might have avoided certain serious errors that disfigured their books, e. g. with reference to inscriptions and buildings in the Forum Romanum, and the Column of Trajan.

<sup>1</sup>The *Poetics of Aristotle, Its Meaning and Influence* (Boston, Marshall Jones Company, 1923).

<sup>2</sup>Opus Majus, 1.101 (edited by John Henry Bridges, Oxford, 1897).

<sup>3</sup>Harold S. Symmes, *Les Debuts de la Critique Dramatique en Angleterre jusqu'à la Mort de Shakespeare*, 29 (Paris, 1903).

<sup>4</sup>Ascham, in the complete edition of Ascham's works, by John Allen Giles, 3.241 (London, 1864); in the edition of The *Schoolmaster*, by W. Aldis Wright, 284 (Cambridge, England, 1904); in the edition of The *Schoolmaster*, by E. Arber, 139 (Westminster, Constable, 1895).



Cambridge to become tutor to Prince Edward in 1544<sup>5</sup>, and hence the friendly discussions of the Poetics probably took place before 1544. With our present knowledge it is impossible to be more exact. As regards date of publication, Bucer's very definite allusion in 1551 must have precedence over Ascham's. Recently, however, I came upon a reference that antedates by several years that of Bucer in 1551 in regard both to writing and to publication.

Ascham's words clearly indicate that his master, Cheke, was familiar with the Poetics, and we might reasonably expect to find some allusion to Aristotle's treatise in Cheke's writings. As far as I know, however, no one has noted a very definite reference to the Poetics in one of his letters to Bishop Gardiner on the pronunciation of the Greek Language. Cheke, in discussing the quantity of the Greek vowels, cites ancient authorities: "De  $\alpha$  et  $\omega$  Plato in Cratylō similiter et in Phaedro loquitur de longitudine et breuitate eorum, Similiter Aristoteles in Poetica"<sup>6</sup>. Cheke knew precisely what he was talking about, for he clearly refers to Poetics, Chapter 21, where Aristotle says that  $\epsilon$  and  $\sigma$  are short vowels,  $\eta$  and  $\omega$  invariably long.

The letter is one of seven that make up the correspondence between Cheke and Bishop Gardiner about the pronunciation of Greek. Cheke was made Professor of Greek in 1540<sup>7</sup>. After his appointment, he, together with Thomas Smith, had introduced a new pronunciation of Greek at Cambridge. But the two scholars encountered strong opposition, their chief opponent being Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, and Chancellor of the University. Ascham wrote (1542-1543): "No one can defend the old barbarous pronunciation better than his lordship of Winchester; but this I will say: he has the strongest, we the best side of the argument"<sup>8</sup>. Gardiner issued an edict forbidding the new mode of pronouncing Greek: "Datum Londini 18. Calend. Junias, anno Domini, 1542"<sup>9</sup>. Thomas Smith, Cheke's great friend, dated his contribution to the battle with the Chancellor August 12, 1542<sup>10</sup>. Gardiner's last letter, a more or less conciliatory one which closed the dispute, is dated "Calendas Octobris"<sup>11</sup>.

Therefore we may safely date Cheke's reference to Aristotle's Poetics in 1542. In 1554, an exile on his way to Italy, he stopped for a time at Basel. There he lent the seven letters of the dispute to Caelius Secundo Curio, a scholar who took it upon himself to publish them in Basel, in the following year, 1555<sup>12</sup>.

The question naturally arises whether Bishop Gardiner and Sir Thomas Smith also knew the Poetics. I have found no direct reference either in Bishop Gardiner's letters to Cheke, or in Smith's letter to Gardiner. It is perhaps worthy of mention, however, that both

Gardiner and Smith distinctly refer to passages in Aristotle's *De Interpretatione*<sup>13</sup> that have traditionally been considered close parallels to the remarks on diction in the Poetics: Ammonius and Boethius had long since recognized the similarity<sup>14</sup>. Perhaps Gardiner and Smith both knew the Poetics as well as the *De Interpretatione*. It is hard to tell. They surely must have had an opportunity to examine the treatise, for it was published in the Basel edition of Aristotle in 1531, the edition in which Erasmus had a hand. But of one thing we may be sure, namely, that Sir John Cheke had studied the Poetics by the summer of 1542.

FELLOW IN ENGLISH,  
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

MARVIN T. HERRICK

## REVIEWS

An Epigraphic Commentary on Suetonius's Life of Gaius Caligula. By Ruskin R. Rosborough. University of Pennsylvania Dissertation. Philadelphia, 1920. Pp. 46.

This work is similar in plan and scope to that of Miss Clara A. Holtzhauser, *An Epigraphic Commentary on Suetonius's Life of Tiberius*, another dissertation from the same University, reviewed in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 13.196-197. The value of such studies is plainly shown in the present instance by the note on Chapter XIII, where a new inscription is cited to amplify the text of Suetonius and correct its implications. At many other points Mr. Rosborough is able to support Suetonius from the evidence he has gathered, and here and there to throw doubts on the statements found in the *Vita*. Thus confirmation is found, among other matters, for the statement (Chapter X) that Caligula assumed the toga virilis informally, for the date of his birth (VIII), and for his popularity with the provincials (XIII); while, apparently, Suetonius was mistaken in saying that Drusus, the brother of Gaius, was an augur (XII). Of all the titles Suetonius ascribes to Gaius (XXII) not one is supported by the testimony of the Latin Inscriptions. It is unfortunate that the author did not at the beginning or at the end sum up for us his impressions as to the reliability of the biographer, instead of leaving them for us to gather on our way through his dissertation. The utility of this and similar studies would be enhanced by a few paragraphs devoted to such a purpose.

Most of the commentary bears on the first twenty-one chapters of the *Vita*, since, as Mr. Rosborough says (Introduction, page 3), "... Suetonius's account of Caligula's reign is confined virtually to the first twenty-one chapters, while the remaining twenty-nine chapters <sic> there are sixty chapters in all > have to do with his career as a monster, which is a feature not likely to be dealt with in inscriptions".

The author seems to have been thorough and painstaking in his work. Consistency is generally maintained in citations, though he does not always employ the latest edition even of a standard work. Thus

<sup>13</sup>Haverkamp 2.323, 483-484.

<sup>14</sup>Ingram Bywater, *Aristotle on the Art of Poetry*, 261 (Oxford, 1909).

<sup>5</sup>John Strype, *The Life of the Learned Sir John Cheke*, 22 (Oxford, 1821).

<sup>6</sup>Cheke, *De Pronuntiatione Linguae Graecae*, in Syvert Haverkamp, *Sylloge Altera Scriptorum*, 2.286 (Leyden, 1740). See also the 1555 edition of Cheke (Basel), page 122.

<sup>7</sup>Thompson Cooper, *Dictionary of National Biography*, s. v. Cheke.

<sup>8</sup>Ascham, in the edition of Giles, I. xxxviii.

<sup>9</sup>Haverkamp 2.207. <sup>10</sup>Haverkamp 2.574. <sup>11</sup>Haverkamp 2.468.

<sup>12</sup>Strype, 95-97; Thompson Cooper, *Dictionary of National Biography*, s. v. Cheke.

Head's *Historia Numorum* is not cited by the pages of the second edition (1910). He is also occasionally optimistic in using as evidence inscriptions or readings that are dubious at best. For example, on page 19, line 3, C. I. L. XIV, 3542, which is called somewhat doubtful in the Corpus, is given without any qualifying note; at line 8 on the same page, Number 3555, is uncertain; and in C. I. L. XIV, 2965, cited on page 16, the words *duovir quinquennalis* perhaps refer to Nero only, and not to Drusus, as Mr. Rosborough says. His spelling of inscriptions which he quotes does not always conform to that of the Corpus, and in his Greek quotations accents are not seldom misplaced. These, however, are minor matters as compared with the accuracy apparent in reference and quotation, borne out by the finding of scarcely any error in verifying a considerable number of passages in various books. It is evident that Mr. Rosborough has done his work carefully.

HAMILTON COLLEGE

DONALD BLYTHE DURHAM

De Fragmenti Suetoniani de Grammaticis et Rhetoribus Codicum Nexu et Fide. By Rodney Potter Robinson. University of Illinois Dissertation (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Volume VI, Number 4. November, 1920). Pp. 195. \$2.00.

The need of a new edition of Suetonius had long been felt when Ihm undertook to prepare one for the Teubner series. He published his first volume, containing the *Lives of the Caesars*, in 1907 (editio minor 1908), but he did not live to complete the work by issuing a second volume. To fill the need of an edition of the *De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* Dr. Robinson set to work in 1915. In order to accomplish his task satisfactorily he collated, through the use of photographic copies, all the existing manuscripts and the five oldest editions; and this dissertation is the fruit of that labor. He hopes to publish the edition soon. Several of the manuscripts had never been collated, and a number of others had not been previously used in the preparation of a text. Thus, according to Mr. Robinson (138, notes 210, 211), out of nineteen manuscripts now known, Osann (1854) used four, Roth (1858) five (although he knew of ten others which had not been collated), and Reifferscheid (1860) six. Moreover, in certain instances these editors employed the collations of other scholars, which were not always reliable. Mr. Robinson points out many errors in them—more than fifteen in the case of Reifferscheid alone—and gives these errors as the reason why previous editors underestimated some of the manuscripts which he finds to be good.

Of these codices, *L<eidensis>* was the chief reliance of Osann and Roth (138), while *V<aticanus 1862>* was best in the judgment of Reifferscheid (138-139). To neither of these does Mr. Robinson grant first rank.

All the extant manuscripts are of the latter half of the fifteenth century, and all go back ultimately to one archetype, now lost, which was brought to Rome between 1431 and 1455. There has been much argument about this codex. The problems connected with it

are very interesting and difficult; but it seems now to be well established (28) that it came from Hersfeld, and not from Fulda or Korvey, as Reifferscheid believed, and that it dated from the ninth or the tenth century, and not from the thirteenth, as Roth held (192). The Codex Hersfeldensis itself was marred by many lacunae (81), and contained other works, notably the minor works of Tacitus, one or more of which appear in most of the extant manuscripts containing the *De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus*; a part of it still survives in some leaves of the Codex Aesinus of the Agricola of Tacitus (24-25). By an elaborate computation based on a comparison of the space occupied in the manuscript and in the Teubner editions of this work of Suetonius and the minor writings of Tacitus, Mr. Robinson establishes the fact that the Codex Hersfeldensis was by one hand. The offspring of this manuscript of the *De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* fall into two families, one containing only the Codex Ottobonianus (O) and the Codex Vindobonensis (W), and the other all the rest. The former family is, in Mr. Robinson's judgment, superior. This view is revolutionary. Codex Ottobonianus was, indeed, used by Reifferscheid, though not highly regarded by him; but the Codex Vindobonensis was discovered in 1878, years after Reifferscheid published his edition, and these two codices have a considerable number of readings which differ from those of the other manuscripts. We may therefore expect Mr. Robinson's text to show many divergences from Reifferscheid's.

The task of collation seems to have been done with scrupulous attention to detail. The *variae lectiones* are recorded, so far as one can judge, with meticulous care. The list of variants is quite staggering in its proportions, and the effect is convincing. The results are probably final. The edition which this dissertation forecasts will be awaited with interest.

The few emendations which the author here proposes are cleverly conceived and well supported; the discussions are too long to repeat here (see pages 85-94, 129, 145-146).

In constructing his stemma Mr. Robinson runs counter to those of Scheuer and Gudeman for the *Dialogus* of Tacitus. For example, they put *V<aticanus 1862>* and *L<eidensis>* in a separate group, whereas he regards all but *O<ttobonianus>* and *W<vindobonensis>* as descended from one copy of the Codex Hersfeldensis. He considers their view to be due to their dependence on Reifferscheid and on Michaelis (191-192).

The Latin throughout is very readable. The desirability of writing dissertations in Latin is open to question; many of us have trouble enough to make ourselves understood in English—to say nothing of comprehending the meaning of what others write. At any rate, the author receives training in Latin composition, which is valuable, though too little practiced. It is almost inevitable that in two hundred pages some errors should occur, although the reviewer found very few. The proof-reading has been carefully done, and misprints are rare.

HAMILTON COLLEGE

DONALD BLYTHE DURHAM